

APPLICANT(S): GORDON, Meir  
SERIAL NO.: 10/734,122  
FILED: December 15, 2003  
Page 7

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
DEC 27 2006

#### REMARKS

The present Response and Amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant asserts that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

#### Status of Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 20-29 have been allowed. Claims 1-19 have been rejected. Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 20-29.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS

##### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection Based on Fullerton and Aytur

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,937,667 to Fullerton et al. ("Fullerton") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,079,869 to Aytur et al. ("Aytur"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fullerton in view of Aytur in view of the remarks that follow.

According to M.P.E.P. § 2142, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicant respectfully submits neither Fullerton nor Aytur, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1, 9 and 17 as amended, and therefore a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established by the Examiner with respect to amended claims 1, 9 and 17.

APPLICANT(S): GORDON, Meir  
SERIAL NO.: 10/734,122  
FILED: December 15, 2003  
Page 8

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 17 as amended include, inter alia, "a circuit comprising three quarter-wavelength differential transmission lines to couple two differential input ports to two differential output ports in a first manner; and a quarter-wavelength differential transmission line to couple one of said two differential input ports to one of said two differential output ports in a second, different manner."

Applicant's independent claim 9 as amended includes, inter alia, "a circuit comprising a first group of six reactive elements to couple two differential input ports to two differential output ports in a first manner; a second group of two reactive elements to couple one of said two differential input ports to one of said two differential output ports in a second, different manner; and a third group of four reactive elements, each to couple a positive terminal and a negative terminal of a respective one of said two differential input ports and said two differential output ports."

Neither Fullerton nor Aytur, alone or in combination, disclose a single circuit comprising three quarter-wavelength differential transmission lines to couple two differential input ports to two differential output ports in a first manner; and a quarter-wavelength differential transmission line to couple one of said two differential input ports to one of said two differential output ports in a second, different manner as is required in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 17, as amended.

Neither Fullerton nor Aytur, alone or in combination, disclose a circuit comprising a first group of six reactive elements to couple two differential input ports to two differential output ports in a first manner; a second group of two reactive elements to couple one of said two differential input ports to one of said two differential output ports in a second, different manner; and a third group of four reactive elements, each to couple a positive terminal and a negative terminal of a respective one of said two differential input ports and said two differential output ports as is required in Applicant's independent claim 9, as amended.

Neither Fullerton nor Aytur, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 9 and 17 as amended. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 17 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Fullerton in view of Aytur be withdrawn.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 27 2006

APPLICANT(S): GORDON, Meir  
SERIAL NO.: 10/734,122  
FILED: December 15, 2003  
Page 9

Each of claims 2-8, 10-16 and 18-19 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 9 and 17, and includes all the features of the claim from which it depends as well as additional distinguishing features, and is therefore allowable.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 USC §103(a) over Fullerton in view of Aytur be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Response and Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

No fees are believed to be due associated with this paper. If any such fees are due, please charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

/Caleb Pollack/  
Caleb Pollack, Reg. No. 37,912  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Dated: December 27, 2006

Pearl, Cohen, Zedek, Latzer LLP.  
1500 Broadway, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10036  
Phone: 646-878-0800  
Fax: : 646-878-0801